

Republic of Iraq
Ministry of Information



**America reaps the thorns
its rulers sowed
in the world**

**Republic of Iraq
Ministry of Information**

Saddam Hussein

**America reaps the thorns
its rulers sowed
in the world**

***America Reaps the Thorns its Rulers
Sowed in the World***

President Saddam Hussein © 2001

First published by Ministry of Information, Republic of Iraq
printed at Al-Hurriya Printing House, Baghdad

**This facsimile edition published by
The Ministry of Peace
139 Vauxhall Street, London SE11 5LL
00 44 (0)207 582 3734
jamesbthring@breathe.com**

**with sponsorship from Lavinia Jowett
New Manor Farm, Winterslow, Salisbury, SP5 1SP
00 44 (0)1980 863 034**

*“The world will deal with [the US] in respect and love,
when they see love and respect in America’s relations
with them. The world, including the US, will live in
peace and not on the brink of an abyss.” (p.61)*

As the author is held *incommunicado* in an unspecified prison
by US Forces occupying Iraq at the time of printing and as the
original Iraqi Ministry was destroyed during the US invasion
of Iraq in March 2003, this edition is reprinted in good faith
from an original given to Dr James Thring in Baghdad, under
the power of the author’s attorney

Catalogue reference is available from the British Library

ISBN: 0 – 955 1681 – 0 - 4

**Reprinted from the original
May 2005
Salisbury, Wiltshire**

Contents

- Introduction	5
- Sow no evil, reap no evil	7
- Open letter from Saddam Hussein to the American peoples and the western peoples and their governments	11
- A second open letter from Saddam Hussein to the peoples of the United states, western peoples and governments	19
- A viewpoint inspired by the ideology of the Ba'th and the Ba'thists' conscience addressed to the sons of our nation published in Al-Thawra daily on Sep. 24, 2001	29
- President Saddam Hussein's address to the 46 th cabinet meeting on Oct. 7, 2001.	45
- A third open letter to all the peoples and governments of the West, including the US on Oct 29, 2001	53

Introduction

President Saddam Hussein's three letters to the American and Western peoples and governments on September 14, 18, October 29, 2001, his excellency's speeches and the viewpoint published in Al-Thawra daily on September 24, 2001 all represent an in-depth capability and a manifestation of an audacious clear vision based on well-established principled attitude let alone being messages of wisdom aimed at laying bare before the world's eye the bitter truth about America. The letters also include an in-depth analysis of the root causes of the problem and its ramifications. They also define the course as to what should be done by the US in order to relinquish its policies that have rendered it abhorred in all parts of the world. It is not the first time, President Hussein uses open letters addressed to others at a crucial urgent time.

President Hussein was the first to detect and caution against the hazards of the events that are taking place in the US. This does not only denote full awareness of the perils ensuing from jeopardising the state of balance but also goes further to include other topics of no less significance, most important of which his excellency's warning against converting the war to a crusade against Islam, a state that would leave the Jews the only party that can emerge unscathed and exploit the situation that ensues.

The call for wisdom included in President Hussein three letters to the US administration depicts a full awareness of the human and historic responsibility. They also manifest the wisdom of a believer, the philosophy of a leader who can anticipate the outcome well in advance, the patience of a jihadist because counsel at this time has no place in the dictionaries of so many rulers and officials in today's world.

President Hussein calls upon the US administration to explore the future after it (the administration) has proved to be in a haste for military action. His excellency's definition of the type and place of the use of force was very clear and deep when

he defined in an unequivocal way the difference between force and the concept of capability. The latter is based on justice, logic, sensibility and clear vision while force lies outside this course for the simple reason that it is blatant and baseless.

Days have elapsed to reveal the truth about the intentions harbored by the US vis-a-vis targets whose definition can by no way be outside the concept of Islam. Days have also given credibility to President Hussein's unblurred insight, his sound analysis of the course of events. By taking recourse to war, the US administration has in fact not heeded calls for wisdom and reason. It has not learnt the lessons of the past either and not realized scourges of war it experienced when it burnt its own fingers. Such a policy is bound to inflict more tribulations because the policy of terrorism adopted by the US would only add new entries to the already long list of foes.

- 1 -

Sow no evil, reap no evil

President Saddam Hussein's speech on September 13, 2001 during an audience with Deputy prime Minister, Minister of Military Industry and a group of fighters, engineers and researchers in the Military Industry Commission. His excellency's speech included remarks on the attacks on Washington and New York on September 11, 2001. Below is his excellency's remarks:

Regardless of the conflicting humanitarian emotions over what happened in America yesterday, America is only reaping the thorns sowed by its rulers in the world, the thorns that not only made the feet of those concerned bleed, but also the eyes of those who shed alot of tears over their dead whose lives were taken away by America. The US has left no place without a memorial set up by its people to remind them of a criminal act by the US against them, be it in Japan which was the first to experience American nuclear weight which Washington has boasted, Vietnam and Iraq, its action against the Russian submarine let alone the crime it is perpetrating by supporting the criminal racist Zionism against our heroic Palestinian people, men and women, young old and children.

Would the American peoples save themselves and the world as well from the malice of their rulers, their terrorist crimes against the world? Or, would their rulers, who have become a toy in the hands of the criminal international Zionism and its poignant entity which usurped the land of Palestine and Arabs, turn the feelings of the Americans into new terrorist projects against the world as would cater for the Jewish Zionist greed for illicit wealth and innocent blood?

Let the American peoples remember that none has crossed the Atlantic to reach them all throughout history, wielding arms against them. It is America that has crossed the Atlantic carrying with it death, devastation and insatiable exploitation to the entire worlds.

We, nonetheless, hope to remind the peoples of America that the lives that have perished under American weapons,

American scheming and conspiracies, can ascend to the. Lord of Heavens and Earth to complain the injustice of America. Indeed, God Almighty can see for Himself. When He decides to strike, nobody can deter His power.

Who does not want to reap evil, has to sow no evil. Anyone who cares for the lives of his own peoples as being precious and dear, must remember that the lives of people in the world are dear too. America is exporting evil, corruption and crime, not only to spots where its armies deploy but also to whoever its films can reach.

American peoples have, therefore, to remember all this. If they choose to remember it, they would rescue their own security, the security of the world and their rulers. If what happened to America is an internal affair, the household would be in a better position than others in diagnosing the disease.

- 2 -

**Open letter from Saddam Hussein
to the American peoples and the
Western peoples and their
governments...
Sep. 14, 2001**

In the name of God, the most Compassionate, the most Merciful.

Once again, we would like to comment on what happened in America on September 11, 2001, and its consequences. The comments we made on the next day of the event represent the essence of our position regarding this event and other events, but the aftermath of what happened in America, in the West in particular and in the world in general, makes it important for every leader to understand the meaning of responsibility toward his people, his nation, and humanity in general to follow up the development of the situation, to understand the meaning of what is going on, and hence to elaborate his country's and people's position so as not to restrict oneself to only following the event.

When the event took place, Arab rulers and the rulers of countries whose religion of their people is Islam, rushed to condemn the event. The Westerners rushed within hours to make statements and adopt resolutions, some of which are dangerous ones, in solidarity with America and against terrorism.

Even before being sure, Western governments decided to join their forces with the America even if that meant declaring war on the party that will be proved to have been involved in what happened.

It is only normal to say that by the explanation of the present situation, as it has been said or by comparison to the action previously taken by America against specific countries, it could be enough for some of the executors of the operation to have come from a country named by America or said to have instigated the operation, for the American military retaliation on what they call an aggression. We don't know if they would do the same thing whether any of the planners and executors of the operation were found, to have lived or held the nationality of a

Western country or whether the intention and the designs are already made against an Islamic party.

It is most probable from the beating of media war drums that America and some Western governments are targeting a party who won't be but Muslim.

The event that took place in America is an extraordinary event. It is not a simple one. According to figures announced by official American sources or by what has been spread by the media, the number of victims is great. Nobody has any doubts or denies that America and the West have the capabilities to mobilize force and use it, to inflict destruction on others on the basis of simple doubts or even whimsically, and can send their American missiles and the NATO fighters to where ever they want to destroy and harm whoever America decides to harm in a fit of anger, by greed, or by being pushed by Zionism.

Many countries of the world have suffered from America's technological might, and many peoples do recognize that America had killed thousands or even millions of human beings in their countries.

The event that took place in America was an extraordinary one. It is not a simple event .

It is the first time that someone crosses to America to unleash the fire of his anger inside it, as indicated by what was said by the media, on the hypothesis that the executors of this act came from abroad.

Since this event is unprecedented, is it wise to deal with it by precedent methods that can be used by whoever has the technical and scientific capacities of America and the West !?

If the target and the aim is one or more Islamic countries, as it has been said by the media and the intelligence services of some Western countries, this would only fall in the same direction that America and the West have always taken by targeting their fire on wherever they want to experiment a new weapon on.

We ask again: America's targeting the fire of its weapons on specific targets, and harming it or destroying it with the

support of Western governments and of a fabricated story would it solve the problem? Would this bring security to America and the world? Or Isn't the use by America and some Western governments of their fire against others in the world including, or in the forefront of whom the Arabs and the Muslims, is one of the most important reasons of the lack of stability in the world at the present time?

Isn't the evil inflicted on America in the act of September 11, 2001, and nothing else is a result of this and other acts? This is the main question and this is what the American administration along with of the Western governments or the Western public opinion should answer in the first place with serenity and responsibility, without emotional reaction and without the use of the same old methods that America used against the world.

On September 12, 2001, we said that no one crossed the Atlantic to America carrying weapons before this event, except the Westerners who established the United States of America. America is the one who crossed the Atlantic carrying arms of destruction and death against the world. Here we want to ask a question: wasn't the use of American weapons, including the nuclear weapon against Japan, enough before September 11, 2001, for America to prepare to use it in a heavier and a stronger way? Or isn't using it in an irresponsible way, and without justification as does any oppressive force in the world, is what made America the most hated country in the world, starting from the Third World, to the Medium World and passing to the civilized world, as is the world divided by the West and America?

The national security of America and the security of the world could be attained if the American leaders and those who beat the drums for them among the rulers of the present time in the West or outside the West become rational, if America disengages itself from its evil alliance with Zionism, which has

been scheming to exploit the world and plunge it in blood and darkness, by using America and some Western countries.

What the American peoples need mostly is someone who tells them the truth, courageously and honestly as it is. They don't need fanfares and cheerleaders, if they want to take a lesson from the event so as to reach a real awakening, in spite of the enormity of the event that hit America. But the world, including the rulers of America, should say all this to the American peoples, so as to have the courage to tell the truth and act according to what is right and not to what is wrong and unjust, to undertake their responsibilities in fairness and justice, and by recourse to reason, passion, according to the spirit of chance and capability.

In addition, we say to the American peoples, what happened on September 11, 2001 should be compared to what their government and their armies are doing in the world, for example, the international agencies have stated that more than one million and a half Iraqis have died because of the blockade imposed by America and some Western countries, in addition to the tens of thousands who died or are injured in the military action perpetrated by America along with those who allied with it against Iraq. Hundreds of bridges, churches, mosques, colleges, schools, factories, palaces, hotels, and thousands of private houses were destroyed or damaged by the American and Western bombardment, which is ongoing even today against Iraq. If you replay the images of the footage taken by the Western media itself of this destruction, you will see that they are not different from the images of the two buildings hit by the Boing airplanes, if not more atrocious, especially when they are mixed with the remains of men, women, and children. There is, however, one difference, namely that those who direct their missiles and bombs to the targets, whether Americans or from another Western country, are mostly targeting by remote controls, that is why they do so as if they were playing an amusing game. As for those who acted on September 11, 2001,

they did it from a close range, and with, I imagine, giving their lives willingly, with an irrevocable determination.

For this reason also, the Americans, and the world with them, should understand the argument that made those people give their lives in sacrifice and what they sacrificed themselves for, in that way.

When one million and a half Iraqi human beings die, according to Western documents, from a population of twenty five million, because of the American blockade and aggression, it means that Iraq has lost about one twentieth of its population. And just as your beautiful skyscrapers were destroyed and caused your grief, beautiful buildings and precious homes crumbled over their owners in Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq by American weapons used by the Zionists. In only one place, which was a civilian shelter, which is the Ameriah Shelter, more than four hundred human beings, children, young and old men and women, died in Iraq by American bombs.

In the same day, the 11th of September, one of their aggressive military airplanes was shot down over Iraq. And on the same day of the event in America on 11th September, and American jetfighter was perpetrated aggression against Iraq and was shot down.

As for what is going on in Palestine, if Zionists let you see on your TVs the bodies of children, women and men who are daily killed by American weapons, and with American backing to the Zionist entity, the pain you are feeling would be appeased.

Americans should feel the pain they have inflicted on other peoples of the world, so as when they suffer, they will find the right solution and the right path.

All that has been inflicted on the Arabs and Muslims by America and the West, didn't push Muslims to become racists and harass the Westerners who walk in the streets of Baghdad, Damascus, Tunis, Cairo and other Arab capitals, even when the Westerners, and especially Americans insulted the holy sites of Muslim and Arabs by what is almost an occupation of Saudi

Arabia in order to launch their evil fires against Baghdad, and when the American carriers roam the Arab Gulf, and their fighters daily roam the sky to throw tons of bombs and missiles over Iraq, so that about two hundred thousand tons of bombs have been used against Iraq, in addition to using depleted uranium!! All these are facts that are very well known not only to Arabs and Muslims, but to the whole world also. But because of only one incident that happened in America in one day, and upon an unconfirmed accusations so far, Arabs and Muslims, including some who hold the American citizenship, are being harassed openly and publicly in America and some Western countries. Some Western countries are preparing themselves to participate in an American military action, against an Islamic country as the indications point out. In this case, who is being fanatic?

Isn't this solidarity, and this in-advance approval by some Western leaders, of a military aggression against an Islamic country, the most flagrant form of the new Crusades, fanaticism. It reminds Arabs and Muslims of those Crusade war launched by the West and NATO against Iraq?

Finally, if you, rulers respect and cherish the blood of your peoples, why do you find it easy to shed the blood of others including the blood of Arabs and Muslims? If you respect your values, why don't you respect the values of Arabs and Muslims?

America needs wisdom, not power. It has used power, along with the West, to its extreme extent, only to find out latter that it doesn't achieve what they wanted. Will the rulers of America try wisdom just for once so that their people can live in security and stability?

In the name of God, the most Compassionate, the most Merciful.

Invite all to the way of thy Lord with the wisdom and beautiful preaching, and argue with them in ways that are best and most gracious, for the Lord knoweth best who have strayed from His path and who receive guidance."

14/9/2001

- 3 -

**A second open letter from
Saddam Hussein to the peoples
of the United States, Western
peoples and governments.
Sep. 18, 2001**

In the name of God, the most Compassionate, the most Merciful.

Once again, we make a return to comment on the incidence that took place in America on September 11, not for its significance as such, but for the implications surrounding it and its ramifications in terms of results on the level of the world of which we are part or rather a special case as a nation known as it is with the basis and uniqueness of its faith.

On previous occasions, we have already said that the United States needs to try wisdom after it has tried force over the last fifty years or even more. We still see that this is the most important thing the world must advise the US about if there is anybody who wants to say something or adopt an attitude towards this incidence, and who is concerned about world peace and stability. This is the case if the US and the world are convinced with the dictum and the verdict, namely that what has happened came to America from without, not within.

It is among the indisputables in the law or general norms, in dealings, in social life, and even political life, that any charge should be based on evidence if the one who makes the accusation is keen to convince others or has respect to that who listens to the accusation or is concerned with it as part of the minimal obligation of his duty. But the US has made the charge before verification, even before possessing the minimum evidence about such a charge. It has even not availed itself the opportunity to verify things, first and foremost. It started a drive of incitement and threat, or said something irresponsible by broadening the base of charges to include states, circles and individuals.

American officials set about making charges or giving the guided media, the Zionist media and its symbols within the authority and outside it a free hand in order to prepare the public mind for the charge.. What does this mean?

In a nutshell, it means that the US gives no heed to the law or rely on it. It has no concern for the counter viewpoint in line

with its dangerous policy towards this issue or others. That is why we find that it takes no pain to secure evidence. Therefore, it needs no evidence to pass its verdict. It is content with saying something, passing verdicts, whether people other than the American officials are convinced or not. This means, in keeping with the policy it has pursued since 1990, that it has no regard to the viewpoint of the peoples and governments in the world in its entirety. It gives it no weight or heed despite the fact that it claims to be the democratic state (number one) in the world. The basic meaning of democracy even by the standards of its initial emergence in the Western world, that facts should lay bare before the people so that the people would assume their responsibility with full awareness. Our description of the US attitude vis-à-vis this incidence is a practical description. It means that American officials do not respect even their own people's viewpoint, let alone the world's. In this conduct, the American officials behave as though they are deluding the peoples, beating up the misleading media drums to do the job of mobilizing them against enemy or enemies against whom no evidence about their accountability for the action they are accused of has been furnished. All the officials there seek to achieve is to foment the hostility of the peoples of the US against whoever they assumed to be an enemy before the incidence has occurred. The tax-payer would be in a position where he is prepared to accept the blackmail trap arms manufacturers have laid for him in addition to the wrangled interests on the level of senior military and civil officials in the US.

One might argue that political verdicts do not always emanate from the same bases, procedures or courses adopted by the judiciary or criminal courts. Rather, precedents and backgrounds could suffice to arrive at a conclusion which may prove right. Even if, for the sake of argument, we go along this notion, just to keep the debate uninterrupted, we say that this could be true about the media and statements which are of media and

propaganda nature, even political statements. In this instance, the error could not be necessarily fatal.

But is this permissible in war?

Once more, we say that war is not an ordinary case. Neither is it procedural in the life of nations and peoples. It is a case of unavoidable exception. Evidence based on conclusion is not enough, even if it is solid to make a charge against a given party or several parties, a state or several states to the extent that the one who makes the charge declares war at the party or parties against which charges were made and bears the responsibility of whatever harm might be sustained by his own people and the others including death, the destruction of possessions and the ensuing serious repercussions. It was only the US administration that has made the charge against a certain religion, not just a given nationality.

Let us also accept the interventions of those who contend that the US has not said this, through its senior officials and within this limitation. In fact, some officials have denied that their policy is one of making the charge against a given religion. However, we believe that the lack of evidence to make a charge, the disrespect to the golden sound rule of proper accusation which leads to the declaration of war and restricts the charge to a certain nation, states, designations and individuals, can only be understood as a premeditated charge without evidence that the action was carried out by Moslems. This is complemented by free reins for the media to float it, to prepare the public opinion to accept it or to be tuned to it so that anything opposed to it would sound like a discord.

Below is the list:

Afghanistan.. Usama bin Laden... the Islamic Qa'ida (base) party or organization... Syria.. Yemen... Algeria.. Iraq... Lebanon...Palestine. The list may be curtailed or enlarged according to the pretexts of the policy of power, which has found its opportunity or the power that is looking for its opportunity to declare war. Whether the items of the list are

increased or cut down, would all this mean anything but the accusation of Moslems, including, or rather in the forefront of whom Arabs? Why should this cross the minds of US officials unless they have basically assumed themselves and their policy to be enemies of Arabs and Moslems?

Could this charge mean anything other than the desire to settle old scores, all based on the assumption that their foreign policies are incompatible with the American policy, or they do not give in to the US-Zionist policy vis-à-vis the world and Palestine?

Consider statements by the US officials who say the war would be long because it is aimed at several states. Notice the blackmail or better, the terrorism they mean and which was designed to include several states and parties on a list that could be longer or shorter in accordance with a policy of sheer terrorism and blackmail, first and foremost, the illusion that Arabs and Moslems and the people of Palestine would leave the arena for the aggression of the Zionist entity and its vile imperialism.

These charges which were made without consideration and in an instantaneous way mean that the mentality of the US administration has been pre-loaded, prior to the incidence, even if we apply the norms of today and not the norms of the law. It has made assumption tantamount to conclusive verdict, namely that Islam, with Arabs in the lead of Moslems are enemies of the US. More precisely, the US on the level of its rulers has taken it as a final verdict that it is the enemy of Arabs and Moslems. In so doing, they have stored the final verdict in their minds. On this basis, they built their preparation in advance. On this basis too, they prepared (the mind) of the computer, which was programmed on this assumption, which has taken the form of a conclusive verdict. This reminds us of the free reins given to political writers, the so-called thinkers, inculcate heads of state and ministers who the Zionist policy wanted, over the last ten or fifteen years to assume that faith based on the religion of

Islam with the ensuing implication is the new enemy of the US and the West and it is the backdrop against which American rulers act, with the participation of some Western rulers who came under the pressure and interpretations of Zionist thought and scheming.

Obviously, this assumption is no longer a pure assumption for the purpose of scrutiny testing and examination. It has become part and parcel of conclusive verdicts. That is why the verdict was instantaneous, without consideration or waiting for the evidence to have a basis, evidence on which the pre-supposition is based in order to be a conclusive one. The charge has not only been made against all governments in Islamic or Arab states but also against all Islamic peoples, including the Arab nation and to all designations, parties, states and governments whose policies do not please the US, whose policies and positions are not palatable to the US in particular or because they call for the liberation of Palestine and a halt to the US aggression on Iraq, and adherence to their independence and their nations' heritage.

Any one who is surprised by this practical conclusion, allowing courteous words to be said on the margin of verdicts to replace it, has to contemplate our verdict:

The US has declared it is at war. It is gearing up for war since the early moments in the wake of the incidence, as though it were the opportunity those concerned have been waiting for. It has allocated the necessary funds for the war, or part of them. Have you ever heard or read in the near or far history, of a state declaring war before even defining who its enemy is? The opportunity to declare the state of war came with the incidence that befell it. It is not yet known whether it was carried out by a foreign enemy or from inside. Thus, the war declared by America would cease to be a reason for the incidence. Rather, it is the incidence that has availed the opportunity to launch the war, which has not been a result of the incidence under any circumstances!

One might contend it is the nature of the incidence, the scale of pain the American officials felt as a result of what their peoples suffered, the embarrassment they felt due to the sufferings that hit the people there, that prompted American rulers to rush to declare war. The suffering of the people is not caused by the incidence alone, but by the failure of the authorities concerned which have been preoccupied by hatching conspiracies abroad, assassination and sabotage operations against world states and freedom-loving people. They rushed to declare war and name the parties so that they would leave no option but to launch the war. Once again, we say, could this be a reason and ground to facilitate the charge and the subsequent resolutions, why should not it be a ground for others as well?

If the fall in the whirlwind of rage, not the pre-meditated planning, results into war resolutions on their senior level inside the US, why should not you expect someone to direct his fire to it under the pressure of similar considerations or danger?

Once again we say that the US administration and those in the West who allied themselves with it against Arabs and Moslems, now and in the past, or rather against the world, in all the arenas that witnessed the scourges of the alliance, are in need to take recourse to wisdom after they have had power at their disposal and deployed it to such an extent that it ceased to frighten those who experienced it. Dignity, the sovereignty of the homeland and the freedom of the sincere man is a sacred case, along with other sacred things which real Moslems uphold, including Arabs who are in the lead.

If this is the practical description of the pre-mediated intentions that decided war against Arabs and Moslems, while the party that took the decision waits for a cover to declare a war, and may launch it against those whom it has been biding time, could there be anyone who could avert it other than God, the Almighty? Anyone other than the will of the peoples, when they become fully aware, after they know and fear God, after they have believed in Him.

"For us Allah sufficeth, and He is the best disposer of affairs". (Holly Quran)

Once again we say that the peoples do not believe any more the slogans of the United States, accept those whom it intends evil against. Even when it says it is against terrorism, the United States doesn't apply this to the World, and according to the International Law. But according to its will to impose what it wants on the World and refuse what it thinks might be harmful to it only, and export the other kinds of it to the World. To certify this, could the United States tell its peoples how many organizations working against their own countries are existing in the United States? And how many of those, the term terrorism could be applied to if one standard is used and not the double standards? And how many are those it finances overtly and covertly? How many are those accused with killing and theft in other countries are now in the United States? If the United States presents such inventory to its peoples and to the World, and initiated implementing one standard and one norm on its agents and those it calls friends. And if it starts the same storm against the killers in the Zionist entity responsible of killing Palestinians in occupied Palestine and in Tunis and Lebanon. And if it charges its own secret services with what they committed of special actions and assassinations they brag to publish in the form of stories. Only then one can believe the new American slogans that America is trying to make them believe. Only then it becomes legitimate to ask the World to do what it believes is useful for its security and the security of the World.

It is a chance to air an opinion whose time has come. It is also addressed to the peoples of the US and the Western people in general. Zionism has been planning for the domination of the world since its well-known conference it convened in Basle in 1897. Ever since, it has been working in this direction. It has scored successes you can feel by controlling finance, media and commerce centres in your countries and whoever rules in your

name, here and there, in decision-making centres. But its domination is not yet fulfilled to have its will absolute and final. This could only be feasible when two heavenly faiths upheld by the biggest bloc in the world are thrown into conflict. Otherwise, Zionism would be denied the accomplishment of all its ambitions. The masterminds of Zionism are, therefore, working for a clash between Christianity and Islam on the assumption that this, and only this, could secure the chance to dominate the world, when new opportunities open up for their domination. Could there be any better situation than that when the stealing dog finds his household pre-occupied by a grief so that it could win the thing it has set its eye on, the thing that whetted its mouth? Would the sensible men in the West be aware of that? Or would Zionism outsmart them to attain its aims?.

18/9/2001

- 4 -

**A viewpoint inspired by the ideology of
the Ba'th and the Ba'thists' conscience
addressed to the sons of our nation,
published in Al-Thawra daily on
Sep. 24, 2001**

In the name of God, the most Compassionate, the most Merciful

Initially, it is neither in defense of anybody nor on attack on someone. Rather, it is a word of justice dictated by duty and in practice of our responsibility towards our nation and people. Comrade President Saddam Hussein has already addressed two letters to the people of the United States and European peoples and rulers. In these two letters, he asserted what he believed to be valid for humanity, including our nation. He strived to use his discretion in accordance of what God ordered the elite, those who occupy positions and assume responsibilities, those who would have to account for their role and performance on the Day of Judgement more than others. In fact, they would be the first to be questioned when God, Almighty would question others. This is so because those who assume responsibility amongst their peoples, as we see it, on the basis of the eternal culture of our nation which we inherited, its role in disseminating faith, the last of which is the message of the true religion of Islam. Judgement on the Day of Judgement would be conducted in the light of each individual's powers and his influence. God Almighty would be stricter with those who He has been generous with in earthly life than those who have lived deprived. The deprived have the consolation that they have been deprived and this is a way to test their faith. If they remain patient in times of plight, they would thrive. If they fail, they would be judged proportionately with their non-compliance with God's orders. As for those of leading designations, they would be judged according to the scope of their responsibility, their influence and their powers. As far as saying what is right, none would be forgiven for not doing so, distinguishing between justice and injustice by words and deeds in the sequence cited by Prophet Mohammed (peace be upon him):

Whoever sees a case of wrongdoing, let him change it by hand. If he cannot, by advice, if again he cannot, by heart and this in the minimum manifestation of faith.

Even this minimal sequence of faith is not envisaged by Prophet Mohammed (peace be upon him) for senior

designations, rich people and those with broad-based powers or the others who he viewed as the guardians of their peoples and homelands. Rather, this case applies to individuals, even to the weakest among them. The rulers, those who occupy key positions in service of the religion or preaching it, have either to rectify the wrong doing with their own hand or by the minimal action that may save them from hell, namely by changing through counsel.

The basis, therefore, for what we mean to say, is not the basis to take anybody to task. It does not mean malice against anybody either. Rather, it is a word of justice in the light of our own interpretation of things so that we may be at the minimal amount that satisfies God and his messenger. It is our consolation that we have tried to give vent to our opinion.

In one of his letters to the Western people, Comrade Saddam Hussein said when the rulers of America had decided to declare war, they acted in haste, even before they verified the situation. They did not give themselves a chance before they commit themselves to war declaration. They could have said what they like and decided what they want, even the declaration of war on whoever they want only after things are unified.

Here again, we reiterate the same thing to some Arabs, including rulers or those who have bestowed upon themselves the label of sheikhs or Moslem scholars. They, too, have failed to give themselves a chance to consider the good and the evil, not only on the basis of the general principled religious standards where the room for discretion is restricted by what is written, but also but in dealing with those whom America hand picked (for charges) at moments of anger. It was they who America meant when it declared war. Even recourse to the tenets of Quran needs some time in a matter like this. It can in no way be based on what someone of them has memorized from Quranic texts or what he remembers at the time of spelling out a verdict. Some limits of Quranic verses do not end at a single sura or a single Quranic verse. Neither does it end at one Hadith

(Prophet's saying). Indeed, the situation may sometime requires conjuring up and recalling many excerpts from the holy Quran and Sunna. Even in-depth indulgent in the rulings of precedents and semiprecedents in their essence, when the edges of injustice and justice overlapped, there could be a lot of confusion in many areas so much so that the unbeliever gets muddled up with the Moslem, Jihad with terrorism and injustice with the one who is trying to end it. The recognition of the interpretation by righteous past believers and linking it to today's age, would be such a vast sea for those who are keen not to let their eyes be poked or inner part devoured by the flames of hell.

The people in the vast Arab homeland, in fact in Islamic states by and large, were experiencing a crisis of confidence with their rulers and scholars who undertook to issue fatwas (religious rulings) in their countries or who assumed a senior position in this realm. This crisis of confidence dates back to centuries ago, since the candle of enlightenment in Baghdad was extinguished and aliens of faiths opposed to the religion of Islam or those with no religion began to colonise or occupy the Arab homeland and the Islamic world. Regrettably, the Ottomans over 400 years did nothing positive to Arabs and some Moslems to bridge the gap created by the absence of confidence. In fact, their claim that they were ruling in the name of Islam its contradiction with the essence of what they ruled with and on the basis of which did widen the gap and the prospect of bridging it became impossible. It was this that facilitated for those who harbored ill intentions targeting the Ottoman empire which collapsed totally after the First World War. It was only an inevitable reap of what they sowed, including the policy of Turkification let alone other factors we need not deal with in detail now. With the advent of to era of the so-called national independence from the West which replaced the Turks as an imperialist force, the then educated public opinion accepted the idea of the relative isolation between politics and religion after they had experienced the

Ottoman empire of which they were part and parcel and whose rulers went so far as to try to obliterate the Arabic Language, the language of Quran, carried away by the illusion that this would facilitate the task of governing Arabs.

Intellectuals in the Arab world agreed to this, following in the footsteps of their colonizers and because they lacked the capability of maintaining the balance between the prerequisites of the policy of states that were demi-satellites to the colonizer albeit the direct forms were eliminated from that colonizer under the pressure of the laws of the age let alone other reasons, just to appease the mood of the peoples.

The intellectuals agreed to the separation of politics from religion in step with the interpretation of political rulers and the dictates of religion in the light of its jurists. However, none of the societies accepted at all the notion of separating politics from the root of culture, including the essence of religion. They did not agree to the Western pragmatism away from the values of justice. None of them agreed to see a ruler being undisciplined the Western way, he, his disciples and families, acting in total disregard to the core obligations of man to his religion.

Although the progressive viewpoint which was partly influenced by the practices and slogans of some political movements that prevailed on a large scale, they failed to influence, along with others, the basics of what is deep-seated in the faith of peoples and nations which was based on their faith and eternal heritage, first and foremost, the sons of our Arab Nation. These movements did have some impact on the social Arab Islamic environment in general thanks to parts of the Soviet Union's yardsticks of the progressive meanings during its heydays, especially its support for Egypt and Abdul Nassir in the wake of the Zionist aggression against Egypt in 1956. However, the ideas of Western imperialism along with the popular mood that rejected the Marxist ideology that religion is the opium of the people, the absence of the guardian

who could eliminate confusion, separate right from wrong in words and deeds, all these facilitated the birth of politicized religious movements which had a sole political perspective, which was almost confined basically to combating the Marxist ideology and the soviet influence as represented by communism...This was the prominent phenomenon in the Arab Mashriq (orient) but not in the Arab Magreb up to the fifties. This could be attributed to the fact that independence from the Ottoman imperialism and later on from Western imperialism came earlier in the Arab Mashriq and relatively belatedly in the Arab Magreb. Islam in the Arab Magreb was carrying out a key role by reviving and immunizing its Arabism in addition to enhancing the preparedness of fighters and independence advocates. The Revolution of Algeria and its victory over French imperialist was the epitome of this fact.

To sum up, we say that peoples and nations that uphold Islam have not relinquished the essence of their religion and heritage which was based on it in any phase of history after it had adhered to its faith. Thus, they never compromised with king Farouq of Egypt after he had went too far, nor with Abdul Illah in Iraq, the Shah of Iran in Iran. At the same time, they did not compromise with so many rulers who maintained the form of religion only in their conduct but neglected its revolutionary and progressive essence. So there was the revolution in Yemen. Perhaps there could be other reasons and further examples including the king of Afghanistan who encountered the counter-productive claim that the king was ruling in an outmoded manner while the coup leaders wanted to make Afghanistan progressive!!

Thus Islamic peoples and nations did not abandon the essence, meanings and values of religion, especially its fundamental principles, including and most importantly the support for justice against injustice, the support for the oppressed until he wrests his right from the oppressor, spelling

out what is right, not lying, love for the strong believer and refrain from backing the unbeliever against the Moslem.

When Arab nationalism was on the rise, with its political current which reminds Arabs that they are one nation and are entitled to unite, their example in their initial experience was Abdul Nassir who was a sincere balanced man in his life along with his family. In their private and public life they were almost devotees, put themselves at the disposal of the Nation in the fifties of the past century and up to its sixties despite the difference that ensued from the dictates of politics and rule, the dictates of principles. Each was isolated from the other. There was not bridge to fill the gap: The Ba'th on one side and Abdul Nassir on the other.

Arab officials in general and some Moslem scholars have behaved as incense burners in the sultans' palaces. They did not avail themselves the chance to say the right thing as they should. They found this impossible as judged by their potentialities. In so doing, some committed a serious mistake as they aired specific stances vis-a-vis the incident that hit America on September 11, 2001.

Fanaticism, any form of fanaticism, does not emerge out of vacuum. Rather it is a reaction tuned up by an unjustified over action, or a mean position which is shrouded in darkness. Fanaticism does not generate from a well-considered action, capable of hearing and seeing as it should so that it can affect in the proper balanced way whether it is associated with a bid to rectify what is partial in reality or to improve reality as a whole in terms of quality and comprehensiveness.

We can cite examples from Arab social life or Islamic societies in general on the unbalanced and in genuine action and how it is countered by an unbalanced and ingenuine action too. This can be cited initially from specific homes and families, some of its members went too far in mimicking Western modernity. Others reacted in an isolationist and fanatic manner on the assumption that they were doing so on the right

basis of religion. They believed that the precedent they set in their acts and conduct in life must be rigid so that their attitude would be genuine. In their homes, they could not find a place for the light of modern life, even if that was optional. Their reaction is obsessed with the veneers of civilization as to turn the personality or the specific individuals into ramshackle entities lacking the genuine meaning, the basis of faith that gratifies God and the people. We can notice this on the level of states. Perhaps the example that sponsors religion in Iran now is among the most prominent examples that came just in response to the conduct of the Shah that stood in opposition to any linkage by the people of Iran and the state of Iran to religion and the privilege of Arabism in it. After they had succeeded in assuming power, their response was one of bias and fanaticism in some inherited or passed down forms. But they forgot the right of sincere Arabism and its leading role in religion. They committed the errors which are known. We do not exclude the prospect that Iran would be one day face to face with a counter response as well, something closer to the image of the Shah's rule. Indeed, what can be criticized in the Taleban phenomenon, in the way it chose in religion policy or in manifestation of its foreign and home policy is but a reaction by sincere believers in religion to communism which arrived to abolish religion believing that that was the right course to promote society and to achieve material and social progress and pull out of backwardness. However, it was deluded in assuming that what communism had achieved then in non- Moslem societies or even in Moslem societies under the absence of national will and the absence of the minimal example in the Islamic and Arab societies at the time, could also be achieved in an independent Islamic society, and closer to the influence of Arab Moslems on it. Thus, communism made a fatal mistake. The factor of atheism was the decisive one that generated all religious movements that resisted communism in Afghanistan and emerged victorious over it. In its own climate, Taleban was

born with its reaction taking the form we can see and hear about now.

Once again, we say that first, we Arabs are one nation. Although our being as a nation was prior to the advent of Islam, the collective response and the collective systematic thinking to promote the nation within the framework of a one nation that has a leading role in enhancing humanity had helped nurture a culture of a new model. This was possible after adherence to faith and the practice of that role in the call (for Islam) and its spread in the Levant, then in Iraq and subsequently the establishment of a civilization not only in the name of the nation but also in its collective participation in it despite the acknowledged share of preponderance in this regard. This civilization, in its new meanings and values, prompted the nation in all its states to think and behaves in almost the same way. When its depth is adherence to this religion, it often feels and behave as though it were one household so much so that discrepancies almost fade and under all circumstances, does not constitute a burden on the mobilized society or a stumbling block before it either.

However, with the inauguration by Western imperialism of the phase of controlling the affairs of Arabs and Moslems, aided by Zionism which under the aegis of imperialism or its own covers, partial and casual differences started to form some kind of onus on having a unified position and a one- course march towards specified central aims. These differences also appeared through the development of so many aspects of Arab life on the Western pattern and in some forms of it, even in constitutional and judicial structure, its states and governments, the relation of the citizen with the state, the latter's right and obligations and his own right and obligations. Partial and casual differences also began to have an impact on the timing of the steps and development of the nation, in all its countries to be simultaneous or nearly so. Sectarianism began to spread. Religion alone ceased to be sufficient to stifle it. Sects around

which Moslems have rallied since hundreds of years after religion had already taken root with its applications in the state and society for hundreds of years too, appeared in the tradition of those who had their own interpretations, in the reverse direction as though they (sects) were not eligible as designations under which Moslems could rally.

Since Arabs and Moslem delved into the age of popular politics, in the sense that all the people are concerned with understanding and working under its climate, every new sect came up with an interpretation as though it were a policy but not a religious interpretation which had its own guideline. Since foreign ambitions of states and governments set about looking for new covers, they tried to secure for themselves a sphere of influence in this or that sect (promised by what might bring them closer to the desired range so that they can take aim at their goals. Under all circumstances, they tried to prod any of them or any of their phases, in word and deeds, to act as would guarantee a new policy for a greater division among the people targeted in their schemes. On this basis, supplemented by their non-Arab thinking, the Ottoman Turks adopted in form a sect, or specific sects and so did the Persians or Iranians.

When the conflict developed into a Turkish- Iranian one in some Arab arenas or non-Arab Islamic arenas too, the Iranians, or rather their rulers, tried to change their sect or sects. Then they forced the majority of the people of Iran to adopt a new sect which was not adopted by the Turks in order to keep the two trenches separated not only in politics and the clash of ambitions, but also in sects. They tried to divert sects from the track of interpretation in line with Arab mentality which is keen to preserve the essence of religion and the proper conduct of the scholar to the track of difference and rivalry or even conflict, when they got indulged in in-fighting or when they pushed the one people and the one nation to differ not in search of the sound evidence, but to enfeeble the people and undermine its

mobilization in one direction and in one attitude and even to weaken its spirit.

Motivated by their own motives and their link to the foreigner and the nature of conflicting covets and political leaning on the goals that have a political color in the Arab peninsula, Saudis took a special course at the end of the nineteenth century and the turn of the twentieth century. What Mohammed bin Abdul Wahab came up with all its origins, was termed a Wahbi sect, covertly or overtly. He was backed by the British who supported his influence on politicians. Later, and up to day, the Americans took over this task whenever both were in agreement to take power from the elite who used to rule Hijaz and Ibn Rasheed who used to rule Ha'il and others.

For Arabs, Islamic faith is therefore not only the last religion, the last religion for which they took up the sword and carried the banner to spread it to wherever they could reach on earth but also the eternal heritage of their nation, in its examples and economic and social applications and its fighting tradition against atheism and paganism. Islam's basic faith, as envisaged by Arabs, took shape and emerged on the basis of these deep-seated feeling and faith. Then Arab's stand towards religion is not only the stand of someone who feared God after he believed in Him but also the stand of the religion's custodian, leader and the one who pays the cost of believing in it in the form of streams of blood starting with the first to uphold it down to those who forget apostasy with the sword to carry and protect it to wherever they could take it during the Umayyad and Abbasid eras. The Arabs' stance towards those who got astray from it, those who bear the banner of the peoples in their own countries, is not the same as that of non-Arabs. They are, under all circumstances, more rigorous, tougher in punishment and less lenient towards any form of falsehood and the ensuing charlatry and impotence by those who are demanded to act and speak on the basis of the religion's essence and standards.

Under all circumstances too, the Arabs' stance towards religion in general, not only the religion of Islam, and for the

same reasons, despite the diversity of religion in history, courses and the enemies threats they faced, differs from the west's. Religion was taken to the West who was inspired by it after the Arabs had defended it, be they prophets or followers, until it became a reality. At a time the Islamic religion is not only the faith of Arabs, their choice for the course of linkage between life on earth and the Lord of Heavens, it is also their glorious history, their esteemed civilization and eternal heritage. This explains why the ecclesiastic centre in the West failed to say something specific towards the embargo imposed by the West on Iraq. It did so only after many years had passed. Even when it said it, it was done in a compromising manner and did nothing to stop the war, not only on Iraq but all the wars staged by the west outside its borders, specifically wars on Arabs and Moslems in general. Indeed, clerics sometimes or rather often, were involved in these wars... Have Arab officials and Arab and Moslem religious men said anything about this issue or others before giving their opinion from the religious and political point of view about what happened on September 11, 2001 in America? Or did they rush as to deal with it as a separate case? Basically, they knew themselves, their way of thinking. They know the right and the wrong in what they say or do if they consider saying that the essence of religion for Arabs is not only God's message to them through Prophet Mohammed bin Abdulla but also their glorious civilization and history and their immortal heritage as well.

At any rate, the struggle of religious trends and movements, even the attitudes of uncommitted individuals in addition to other movements in the Arab homeland collectively or individually, was opposed to this or that Arab ruler on the basis of his diversion from religion here or there, or on the basis of his behavioral diversion from religion as is the case with king Faronq who, in one of his life stages dreamed of becoming the Emir of believers... He turned out to be learning towards the (Bahai faith) in lieu of the Ja'fari sect let alone his pervert

conduct by religious standards. The Shah had to meet his fate. There are so many cases we do not want to bother the reader with their details. Brothers, do not take the Nation's conflict inside it by jumping to conclusion, taking political measures that totally contravene the attitude of the people and the Nation.

The hoaxing of some clerics to issue severely critical fatwas of so many religious men and of the Nation in its entirety would eventually deprive them of their influence.

Since they and their likes would remain mostly in their positions, the ruler would lose the minimal link and influence, through them, between him and men of religion or other religious designations.

Officials' clerics, before turning into politicians and incense burners through the religious gown, used to be a linking medium between other religious designations and the people on the one hand, and the ruler and his way of thinking, and the way he believes in the practical aspect of life within his stage on the other.

When the ruler's link is lost in this or other way with national designations within religion, who do not succumb to the covets and scheming of the outsider and with the people and their aspirations on the basis of their faiths, heritage, culture history, the people's reaction would be serious, together with the medium that enfolds the designations of clerics... More often than not, the reaction might well be unbalanced. Indeed, the slogan of the people and the extremist clergymen would be the same, in defense of religion against falsifiers, of history, civilization and heritage against trespassers. Thus sultans and the so-called sultans' preachers who bear the label of religion are the reason of the unbalanced reaction. In so doing, they contribute to the creation of extremism in both religious perspective and action just the way other examples have generated the same things including harm which Arabs sustained at the hands of the West and the Westerners' infringement on the minimal meanings of the civilization,

heritage and history of Arabs and Moslems which resulted in extremism as well. Arabs and Moslems would not be the only losers within their specific arenas and time. Rather, the west would lose as well after it has lost the climate of dialogue and the natural habitat for the exchange of benefits on equal basis and in accordance with the dictates of the respect for man's humanity and the independence of peoples and their countries.

One might ask in surprise how could the Ba'th (party) call for this while it leads national march? Our answer is that our Party is a sincere national party. It is not neutral between faith and other choices. Rather, it is a sincere Party opposed to anything that clashes with faith. On this basis, the Bathist ideology was built, an ideology that calls for the revival of the attitude of a one nation by means of an Arab unity that extends from the Atlantic Ocean in the west to the Arab Gulf in the east. The basis of this call is the fact that our nation is adherent to faith, its history, heritage and civilization and is one. On the basis of this conviction and faith, our state in Iraq behaves. It does not make interpretations on the basis of one sect from among others. It does not agree to be a group within others, engaged in rivalry and ridiculing others' ideas just as other sects do. It would not turn differences in sects in the centre of our sincere national state in Iraq into a reason for distancing itself from the vital contact between attitudes and basic actions. Our interpretation of the principles of economy, politics and social issues is not of people cut off from the essence of religion.

Our outlook and conduct have resolved at the start line and throughout the course, any contradiction between the call for affiliation to Arabism and the obligations Arabism makes incumbent on its sons. It has resolved any contradiction between an obligation accepted by a sincere man and abandoning the basics of faith in dealing with the despots and the Zionists and imperialists who usurp the right of the Nation. It has eliminated contradiction between a claim by someone who claims to be ruling in the name of the people in his own country

and that his people are part of the Arab Nation, that he is a believer while he does not act to pit justice against injustice and is not a genuine representative of the people and the Nation in the face of the covets of the foreigner and any injustice inflicted on the weak by the strong.

Thus we have thought. Thus we have acted and for this we call Arabs to end any contradiction between their national and religious affiliation...and between any clash or contradiction with this in concepts and stances. In so doing, one may win the satisfaction of the people and the Nation after winning God's satisfaction. But, one would not win the foreigner, the imperialism and Zionists' satisfaction. Thus, one has to make one's choice. There could be no sitting on the fence.

On this basis, Iraq is the only state that upholds the essence of religion: the Quran and the Prophet's Sunna, in all schooling stages. We can therefore find three million students attending classes where they are taught lessons in faith, the essence of religions, the Quran and Sunna. Add to this figure, the state and the Party's cadres and judges. Apart from that is left to those who can have their interpretation, each according to his sect. We, therefore, have dialogue with the clergy but we do not follow their interpretation which they assign to the state's performance. We do not attempt to convert them into incense burners in the palaces of sultans. But under all circumstance, we get infuriated by those who receive funds or political instructions from the foreigner or have links with them.

This is what we believe in. It is this that our people as a whole have pledged to us. From God we seek success and help.

- 5 -

**President Saddam Hussein's
address to the 46th cabinet
meeting on Oct. 7, 2001.**

**In the name of God, the most
Compassionate, the most Merciful.**

President Saddam Hussein chaired the 46th cabinet meeting. The council of Ministers followed up the developments of international events and the threats Americans are making. Below is part of his excellency's address:

The (democratic) decisions of America are passed either by threat or bribe...They say we respect the other pinion but unless you behave as we want you to, we would hit you with bombs. If you ally yourselves with us, we will give you money. What a democracy this is...It is a defined democracy...They claim they have pieces of evidence which they allowed Pakistan to see...If they have evidence, why do not they allow the whole world to verify it so that their attitude and argument become solid. Does this mean that if America wishes in the future to accuse any state, it would be sufficient to say I have enough evidence to launch a war on this or that state, or this group or that...Could this be the new tradition of Western democracy in the world. If this state is made against a Western state, they would dismiss it even if all the angels of Heaven come (to testify). But when the charge is made against an Islamic or Arab state, one single satan of earth would be enough to come with a flimsy bit of evidence. They would deem it a basis for his claim as long as it provides the cover for striking at and hamming Arabs and Moslems. This is a flagrant case of injustice. There is a reluctance in resorting to wisdom in order to let the world live in security, stability and prosperity instead of these continued shocks caused by wars, aggression and violations....They don't bother to ask themselves whether they want to use capability in manifestation of malice or even vengeance...or they apply it to make the world secure and stable. The Answer to either of these two questions can only define the course the results of which could be understood from the startline. Of course when the goal

is world peace and security and living in equality, without aggressiveness, this state can only be opposed by the satan.

If it is a mere opportunity to give vent to deep-seated malice, to settle scores, they would not be able to attain what they are after and the cycle would continue, vengeance and counter-vengeance, harm and counter-harm, aggression and a counter means of inflicting harm. Thus, the situation would linger on. At this time, and this round of history, unless imperialism itself asks this question and answers it with wisdom, even its historical influence would. I think, be at a new cross-roads...I can't say (the New York and Washington blasts) are an American or non-American action... I don't accuse, nor do I dismiss. I don't even know who carried them out. We all have emotions towards an act that takes place in this country. There could be an upheaval within this or that individual as an initial response to an act that implies harm. But it is a feature characteristic of senior leaders and officials that after the dust has settled, they start looking around for the reason that prompted those who they view more culpable. What made them arrive at this solution or use this means?

Moreover, their talk should presumably not contravene logic or wisdom. Wisdom, after all, is not weakness but rather it is strength but at the same time it does not nullify the use of force but only when this is proper and with the proper means. As I see it, the tactic has changed but not the basic course of the American strategy. This tactic would lead the world to one of two options: either to say it chooses America or chooses to be its enemy. Which man can agree to be with America when he hears this reasoning of it (America)? Which real man would concede this? He would not agree to be with them even if he is not in agreement with this reasoning of theirs, namely, once we offer you a bribe, you agree to be with us. Otherwise, we hit you with bombs to be, or rather have to be with us. This kind of reasoning would augment their enemies. It would even implicate their friends. Even that who wants to be a friend to

America is now being accused by his own people. In the past, some of America's friends used to say the choice we have is either to be a friend of the former Soviet Union or of America. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, America started expressing its policy in this arrogance and conduct, that who claims to be a friend of America is accused by his own people who ask him why should you be a friend of America while it is in this from you want to make friends with? Could this be due to its morals, wisdom or programs of supporting people and preserving world place and security. The US is covetous, arrogant, exploiting and hostile to peoples. Why should we be friends with it? Things got even worse. It began demanding certain governments, Moslem scholar, striking them with a hammer or bribe them to say...we support America. Things went so bad that even the remainder of the middle link between the ruler and the people has because prone to destruction at the hands of America after they see the falsity, weakness and appeasement at the expense of justice by this or that ruler or by this or that clergyman. This means that the process of destruction of the basic links between the rulers and the peoples is going on to the extent that America is now harming its own friends more than its enemies, or harming its friends just as much as its enemies. America is not looking for friendships. Rather, it is looking for agents and lackeys. This is exactly the imperialist-Zionist logic. They are not seeking friendships based on sincere conviction based on equality and good will. Rather, all they want is someone who says "yes" and follows them. This is the priority for them. The issue of war is not a simple one. Even if we assume that America can unleash its missiles at twenty states, not at one and simultaneously, what would it say if it did that and the accused proved to be another party? How would its position be towards itself, the world, God, history and its own interests? One of the assumptions is that the act is not an external one. At any rate, it could be not the party it chooses as a label to launch aggression on it. What if it dealt the

military strikes at the party it chooses then it discovers that things are different? What would happen? What would happen if it chooses to delay the act of evil to a later time? It can inflict harm just by pressing one button. As for other things, we are unable to say what America could do because God and justice are always greater. It can defiantly harm others. If it is harm that the US seeks, what would happen if it delayed it until facts are discovered? If it is a specific outside party that carried out the action, why should not it make arguments known to the public opinion just as it did with the British Prime Minister? We addressed two letters to them and said all these facts in them. America is technically superior to all the designations it is referring to. So what could deter it from waiting and then it can press the button to unleash the missiles from a distance and fly war planes that launch their bombs from distance. Then and only then, it can press the button and inflict the harm it desires. This is the basic point. As for others, we have already dealt with them. The question is whether this action would increase or decrease hatred to the US. We are offering counsel to America because we fix our eyes in God's as far as our cause and the causes of others are concerned. You find us always giving advice to America not to be indulged in a hasty action. It seems that it is a long story between the Arabs and one hand and the West and its ambitions on the other. Since the saga of Um al-Marik (mother of battles) and since this latest issue, I have been annoyed by the discovery I made, namely that this issue is a long one and its root is so deep that nears the Persian malice against Arabs and our issue with Iran. The Arab is good-hearted. His feeling of strength does not prompt him to be rancorous. His faith deters him from being malicious. Arabs and Moslems under the impact of Arab doctrine and conduct were about to erase from their memory the stories of the harm which the West caused to Arabs, Arabism and Moslems. They began to deal with westerners with open-mindedness and tolerance. They started to make broad-based friendships. But once an

event occurs in the West for which Arab or a Moslem is accused, there emerges a case of solidarity, which is in reality a solidarity as they declared it, but not one for stability. The world is in disarray. We don't know where it is going to end up because the tracks have not been defined yet. Force is like a fire ball. Unless it has human mind, eyes and sentiments, and is only a fire ball rolling the human atmosphere, it cannot decide how much it is going to burn. Its movement is remote controlled and does not know which movement or at what angle it would break down. Then only God knows what could happen.

- 6 -

**A third open letter to all the
peoples and governments of the
West, including the US
on Oct. 29, 2001**

**In the name of God, the most
Compassionate, the most Merciful.**

Once again we address a letter to all the peoples and governments of the West, including the United State.

Peace be upon those who expect a greeting of peace from us, or upon those who answer it by saying: and peace be upon you too (wa Alaikum Asalam).

The world focused its full attention on the analysis and follow up of the events of last September, but those who made an in-depth analysis may have not been the majority of the people. Nevertheless, it seems to us that they have, now, increased in number. The number of officials in power who are looking into the depth of what happened, its motives or reasons, and its results and effects, has also increased. Their number and way of conduct, at the time of the event, was deplorable for those who are not aware that not everyone is capable of a deep contemplation of major events or complex circumstances, just as not many people are capable of dreaming of what is better.

Now that the emotions have relatively calmed down in the heart and spirit of those who applauded the event, or those who condemned it, I say that, the role of leaders should be played, with their people's support, on the basis of the description and the role of their responsibilities. One of the most important qualities of any leader is saving other from death not by marking the dark ditches on the road, but also by preventing those who do not see the marks from falling into the abyss. Then comes the quality of exaltation, or ascendancy of the people he is in charge of, along with their potential thought and action. The danger that may threaten any people or nation, does not call upon the people in charge to lead the way against this danger only, but also to analyze its reasons in view of

abating them, or treating those reasons radically, to eliminate them so that they would never surge again.

I am sorry to say that the general approach in this direction is still weak, so far. Western governments are the first in this phenomena of weakness. Some voices have risen on the part of some peoples, journalists, writers, and, in a very restricted way, the voices of those who are preparing themselves, in the shadow, to replace the rulers there. Nevertheless, the latter are still hesitant voices that deal with the situation in the light of the balance of interests of the posts they expect to occupy, and of the influence of the centers of power. As for the United States, the hope in the awareness of its people is greater than it is in its Administrations, if the people could see the facts as they are, unless these Administrations are set free from the conclusive influence of Zionism, and other centers of influence which serve their own interests that are associated with their well-known goals.

The events of September 11, and the following reaction of people in rage, or those who took advantage of the situation, including waging the aggression on Afghanistan on the basis of suspicions, and the accompanying insinuations and statements by the media or by American, and non-American leaders, have shown that this vast world can be set on fire by a spark coming from the West, even if that spark comes all the way from across the Atlantic. Naturally, setting something on fire is easier than extinguishing it, and because deeds of virtue exalt the soul and the being, while evil deeds downgrade them, the latter become easier to commit for those who are tempted to do so.

On the basis of this realistic image, the entire world needs to be saved from the deep abyss it is being pushed into by the US, and the likes of the US, whether they are states, individuals, or organizations. In fact, now that we

know the limits of how American rulers conduct themselves in crisis, the US itself needs to be saved by the world while it is saving itself. Otherwise, the world will be pulled down by the weight of the US while falling down to the bottom of a deep pit from which it will not be able to come out until that pit is filled with blood and tragedies, not to mention those who will suffocate because they cannot swim.

As we said before to those who launched aggressions on us, including the US, in and before Um-Almarik (the mother of the battles), the world, like Iraq and its Arab nation, needs steadfastness to face the aggression, make it miss its targets. It must not allow the US to be victorious. The victory of the US and its allies over Iraq would conceal the opposing attitude and analysis, and would not allow it to emerge again for a long time. In fact, the US is in no need for additional vanity and arrogance, but if it ever defeated Iraq, God forbid, it would acquire an additional vanity that would push it to a higher level of vanity, which would bring it closer to not farther from the abyss.

Yes, vanity needs to be confronted, and the oppressor needs to be confronted, just as those who find it easy to commit evil deeds and throw embers at people, need to be confronted. On the basis of what we said about Iraq while confronting aggressions, the world now needs to abort the US aggressive schemes, including its aggression on the Afghan people, which must stop.

Again we say that when someone feels that he is unjustly treated, and no one is repulsing or stopping the injustice inflicted on him, he personally seeks ways and means for lifting that justice. Of course, not everyone is capable of finding the best way for lifting the injustice inflicted on him. People resort to what they think is the best way according to their own ideas, and they are not all

capable of reaching out for what is beyond what is available to arrive to the best idea or means.

To find the best way, after having found their way to God and His rights, those who are inflicted by injustice need not to be isolated from their natural milieu, or be ignored deliberately, or as a result of mis-appreciation, by the officials in this milieu. They should, rather, be reassured and helped to save themselves, and their surroundings. It is only normal to say that punishment is a necessity in our world, because what is a necessity in the other world must also be necessary in our world on Earth. But, the punishment in the other world is faire and just, and the prophets and messengers of God (peace be upon them all) conducted punishment and called for it in justice, and not on the basis of suspicions and whims. Hence, any punishment conducted by man must be just and convincing. I think, that you, often criticize those whom you criticize in order to weaken them, by saying that they use emergency laws, and what emergency laws, by Western standards, cannot be a general rule. But now, unlike what you used to say about those whom you accuse of being dictators and despots, we see dozens of emergency laws and measures adopted by the governments of the West, with the US in the forefront, after facing one painful event.

Do you know how many painful events, larger and more dangerous than that of September 11 in US, were inflicted upon countries and peoples whom you used to accuse of being non-democratic?! This fact alone, is an example that should be pondered upon by the governments and peoples of the West, but it is not our main subject here.

Once again, we say that, injustice and the pressure that results from it on people lead to explosions. As explosions are not always organized, it is to be expected that they

may harm those who make them and others. The events of September 11, should be seen on this basis, and on the basis of imbalanced reactions, on the part of governments accused of being democratic, if the Americans are sure that these were carried out by people from abroad.

To concentrate not on what is important, but rather on what is the most important, we say again that after having seen that the flames of any fire can expand to cover all the world, it first and foremost, needs justice based on fairness. The best and most sublime expression of this is in what we have learned from what God the Al Mighty ordered to be, or not to be. If we disagree in understanding the essence of this, then our criteria should be, that we should not prevent others from getting or enjoying what we want for ourselves, and that we should not adopt double standards, by giving others what we do not want or refuse for ourselves. Everybody must be aware that no one who has a fortune can be safe in the middle of a society of hungry people. His problem would be greater if he had made his fortune by exploiting those hungry people, and at their expense. The second Caliph in the state of Islam, Umar Ibin Alkhatib (God be pleased with him) ordered the suspension of the punishment of cutting the hand of a thief in the year of Remada (drought) despite the fact that this punishment is clearly stipulated in the Holy Quran. He did so, because he was aware, by his sense of a believer, the correct standards of Faith may be shaken when a man or his family are hungry, and also because he believed that hunger is more aggressive than the act of stealing, and that saving a man's life was more important than saving somebody's property. Hence, he froze a holy rule (Sharia). Have the people of our present time learned this lesson, so that they can live in peace and security? Or

do the parties concerned think that the security they want for themselves, will be achieved by amplifying the killing, intimidation, and starvation of others?!

We have heard in the news, recently, that American officials think that the source of anthrax is probably the US itself. Is this conclusion or information just a tactic to divert the attention of those who were terrorized to hear that Bin Laden is the source of anthrax, and to hear insinuations to other accusations, that many Americans think that they should not persist in harming the people he cares for, because that would push him to a stronger reaction in this way or by other means? Or have they done this to divert attention from the incompetence of American official bodies in the events of September 11, and they find now that they have achieved their goal and consequently, the act and the actors should be buried?!

Anyhow, this and other things show that weapons of mass destruction become a burden on their owners and on humanity, if they were not absolutely necessary for self-defense and defending their countries.

Hence, instead of getting themselves and the world busy with the so-called anti-missiles shield so that they drain their budget, and the budgets of other nations, as well as the pockets of American tax-payers, they should be busy in eliminating the weapons of mass destruction in the US first, and then or at the same time, in other parts of the world. It goes without saying, that the West, including the US, are the ones who first built the weapons of mass destruction i.e. nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. It was the West, and the US in the first place, who used these weapons. The events of September, and what Americans themselves said that the anthrax came from the US, clearly show the importance of world co-operation, on the basis of a binding agreement to get rid of the burden and the threat of the weapons of mass destruction, as a

first step that might stimulate other steps, if injustice and aggression contracted. The utmost threat to humanity, and to the peoples of the US, is the American weapons of mass destruction, along with the similar weapons of the Zionist entity, and along or after it, the similar weapons of other countries.

As the US is across the Atlantic, it is the first country to be asked to make such an initiative in order to confirm its credibility. And because the Zionist entity usurps and occupies Arab territories, and holy places, oppresses the Arabs and injures their human feelings, and as blunders are expected from it, and the reaction of the oppressed people is to be expected, it becomes necessary to disarm the Zionist entity of these weapons.

At that moment, and when the US is really willing to disarm itself of these weapons, we do not think that anyone of a sound mind would stay out of the framework of such a practical plan.

It is then, that the US will adopt a balanced attitude toward the world, and will find the path of wisdom. The world will deal with it in respect and love, when they see love and respect in Americans relations with them. The world, including US, will live in peace, and not on the brink of an abyss. The surveillance of the prevailing security, will be based on a sort of real solidarity: the solidarity of brave and just men, and not the solidarity based on intimidation and fear of the powerful, or which serves interests or creates opportunities.

I pray to God the Al-Mighty that I have conveyed the message, and let God be my witness.

God is the greatest.

God is the greatest.

October 29, 2001

No. House of Books and Archives, Baghdad (818) year 2001

Ministry of Information

Information Department

Widener Library




3 2044 082 774 340

HD

From the plethora of the heavenly faiths that were revealed in the land of Iraq which has won the blessings of God Almighty, from the code of sublime and noble morals that have taken root in Mesopotamia over ten thousand years, from the history of the civilizations of great Iraq, President Saddam Hussein, the thinker and the leader, came up with deep-seated wisdom. He has transmitted it to Westerners, governments and peoples in three letters and a host of speeches and writings in the hope that rulers of the West would find their way to sensibility and stop their harm to the world at large, the Arab Nation and the Islamic world in particular.

Al-Hurriya Printing House-Baghdad
30 October 2001



9780955168109
AMERICA REAPS THE THORNS IT SOWS